



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| 09/913,885 | 08/17/2001 | Bruno Tisserand | IPG-PT065 | 5990 |
| 3624 7590 02/17/2010 VOLPE AND KOENIG, P.C. UNITED PLAZA, SUITE 1600 30 SOUTH 17TH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103 | | | EXAMINER DIVECHA, KAMAL B | |
| | | | ART UNIT 2451 | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | MAIL DATE 02/17/2010 | DELIVERY MODE PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/913,885 | TISSERAND ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | KAMAL B. DIVECHA | 2451 | |

All Participants:

(1) KAMAL B. DIVECHA

(2) Thomas A. Mattioli

Date of Interview: 12 February 2010

Status of Application: Pending

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

1 and 10

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/KAMAL B DIVECHA/
Examiner, Art Unit 2451

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In view of the applicant response filed 11/25/09 and the amendments to claim 1, a telephone call was initiated by the examiner to get some clarification to claim 1 because the amendments to the claim 1 deleted "generating" and "signalling message" from the first limitation and incorporated "request" into the claim, however, the following limitations of claim 1 still recited "the signalling message" and "the generated signalling message". The scope of the claim and interpretation was not clear in view of this changes. As such, examiner requested the applicant representative to consider filing supplemental amendments clarifying these issues in claim 1, and the applicant indicated that the supplemental amendments would be filed no later than Wednesday Feb 17th. Examiner also suggested further defining the external device in claim 1, deleting the term "denying" and replace it with terminating and further define in the claim 1 and claim 10 that the call is established only when the called party answers and accepts the call and transmitting the user message is without establishing the call. Applicant representative indicated that the representative would have to reconsider the inclusion of "the call is established only when the called party answers and accepts the call and transmitting the user message without establishing the call". No agreement was reached.